

REMARKS/ARGUMENT

The specification has been amended to correct typographical errors.

Claims 1-18 have been canceled to clarify the issues and facilitate allowance.

Claim 19 has been amended to clarify Applicant's invention. It is to be noted that these amendments only make explicit that which was already implicit in the claim and thus does not represent an amendment made for purposes of patentability.

Reconsideration of the application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 19, 20, 22 and 24-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Griesau et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,507,306). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Devices of different manufacturers require different control signals and, therefore, before a device of a particular manufacturer can be controlled by a remote, the remote must be programmed to operate that particular manufacturer's device. Applicant's invention is directed to a method of so programming a remote to control devices manufactured by different manufacturers. Griesau, however, is directed to a method of operating a remote **after it has been programmed to operate a device of a particular manufacturer** and, therefore, teaches nothing about how to program the remote so that it is able to control a particular device. Claim 19 has been amended to clarify this. Thus, the steps set forth in claim 19 for programming a remote so that it can operate a device of a particular manufacturer is neither disclosed nor suggested by Griesau et al. In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that claim 19 is clearly not anticipated by Griesau et al.

Claims 20, 22 and 24-26 are dependent from claim 19 and, therefore, are patentable for the same reason, as well as because of the combination of the features set forth in these claims with the features set forth in claim 19.


Claim 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Griesau et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,507,306) further in view of McConnell et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,872,562). Claim 23 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Griesau et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,507,306) further in view of Huang et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,437,836). Claims 21 and 23 are dependent from claim 19 and, therefore, are patentable for the same reason, as well as because of the combination of the features set forth in these claims with the features set forth in claim 19.

In view of the foregoing this application is believed in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING
SUBMITTED ELECTRONICALLY
THROUGH THE PATENT AND
TRADEMARK OFFICE EFS FILING
SYSTEM ON APRIL 30, 2010

MP/jh



Louis C. Dujmich
Reg. No. 30,625
OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP
1180 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-8403
Telephone: (212) 382-0700